Remarks

Interview Summary

Applicants' representative appreciates the Examiner taking time to discuss the case with her on May 17, 2005. In accordance with 37 CRF 1.133(b), the following interview summary is provided. Applicants had submitted a draft amendment clarifying that the phone call placed 'outside the PBX' was more clearly a phone call place 'other than via the PBX.' As taught in Dowling, a user making an outside call must dial for an outside line through the PBX. The Examiner indicated that he still thinks the subject matter of the claims is obvious.

Response to Office Action

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application. Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-18 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dowling et al. (US Patent No. 6,574,239) in view of Christie, IV (US Patent No. 6,430,176).

Dowling discloses a system in which a user logs into a system remotely and starts a session with a server. If the user disconnects for any reason, the server has set up a session interface on the user's computer that makes it seem as if the user is still connected to the session, even though the user is not. The session information is maintained on the server such that a new session is not initiated when the user's computer reconnects. In the event that the user performs a task on the computer when disconnected that requires connection, the session interface re-dials the server without user interaction. See Dowling, col. 7, line 56 through col. 8, line 16. There is no providing a local call that does not go through the PBX.

During the interview, the Examiner stated that even with the limitation that the local call is made other than through the PBX is obvious. However, the arguments seemed to be based more on phone systems available today, rather than what was available at the time this application was filed, approximately 5 years ago. Further, the examples given by the Examiner do not address the fact that the local call is made other than via the PBX while the

user still connected to the PBX. If the user were not still connected to the PBX, there would be no reason to communicate the off-hook signal to the PBX.

Further, these arguments do not include the prior art that has been cited in this case. It is requested that prior art be submitted that show obviousness of this system at the time the invention was made. As discussed above, Dowling does not disclose the ability to make outside calls without going through the PBX while the user is still connected to the PBX. The text referred to in the Office Action clearly shows that if a user dials '9' for an outside line, the PBX is the entity that grants that line. The addition of Christie to Dowling does not overcome this deficiency, so the combination of references does not teach the invention as claimed.

As amended claims 1, 10, 14 and 18 have been amended to more clearly show that the outside call is made other than via the PBX, and they are made while the user is still connected to the PBX. This is amply supported in the specification at page 4, lines 11-17, and in Figure 4, box 28, where a local call is placed while still in communication with the PBX. As discussed above, this is not shown, taught or suggested by the prior art. It is therefore submitted that claims 1, 10, 14 and 18 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 2, 4-6 and 8-9 depend from claim 1 and inherently contain all of the limitations of that claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach, show nor suggest all of the limitations of the base claim, much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted these claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 11-13 depend from claim 10 and inherently contain all of the limitations of that claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach, show nor suggest all of the limitations of the base claim, much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It

is therefore submitted these claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 15-17 depend from claim 14 and inherently contain all of the limitations of that claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach, show nor suggest all of the limitations of the base claim, much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted these claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 20-21 depend from claim 18 and inherently contain all of the limitations of that claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach, show nor suggest all of the limitations of the base claim, much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted these claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 3, 7 and 19 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dowling in view of Christie, IV and further in view of Foodeei, et al. (US Patent No. 6,445,696).

These claims respectively depend from claims 1 and 18, which are patentably distinguishable over the combination of Dowling and Christie for the reasons discussed above. The addition of Foodeei does not overcome the deficiency of the previous combination to show obviousness of the base claims. Further, the addition of Foodeei does not create a combination that renders the dependent claims in conjunction with their base claims obvious. It is therefore submitted that claims 3, 7 and 19 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an additional interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 20575

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Julie L. Reed

Julie L. Reed
Reg. No. 35,349

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
1030 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205
503-222-3613